



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2013

Mr. Ronny H. Wall
Associate General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Texas Tech University System
P.O. Box 42021
Lubbock, Texas 79409-2021

OR2013-22086

Dear Mr. Wall:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 509561.

Texas Tech University (the "university") received a request for the winning proposal for student debt collection services. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Account Control Technology, Inc. ("ACT"); Continental Service Group d/b/a ConServe ("ConServe"); Reliant Capital Solutions, L.L.C. ("Reliant"); and Williams & Fudge, Inc. ("Williams") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from ACT. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted proposals of ConServe, Reliant, and Williams are not responsive to the instant request because these proposals were not the winning proposals.

The university need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

Next, ACT claims its "financial records and audit reports" are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a

¹The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Having considered ACT’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine ACT has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of ACT’s submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of ACT’s arguments and the information at issue, we find ACT has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its submitted information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, ACT has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Accordingly, none of the responsive information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the university must release the responsive information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 509561

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lynn Heineman
Senior Vice President of Sales &
Marketing
Account Control Technology, Inc.
21700 Oxnard Street, Suite 1400
Woodland Hills, California 91367
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Margie Brickner
Reliant Capital Solutions, LLC
750 Cross Pointe Road, Suite G
Gahanna, Ohio 43230
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark E. Davitt
Continental Service Group, Inc.
200 CrossKeys Office Park
Fairport, New York 14450
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher P. Ruh
Williams & Fudge, Inc.
300 Chatham Avenue
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
(w/o enclosures)